

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 6-11, 13-15, and 25 are pending in the application, with claims 6, 11, and 25 being the independent claims. Claims 1-5, 12, and 16-24 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claim 25 is sought to be added. Independent claims 6 and 11 are amended for further clarification. Claims 7, 10, and 15 are amended for purposes of clarity in light of the amendment to independent claims 6 and 11. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action states on page 2 that claims 1-3, 16-17, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,621,128 B2 to Lee *et al.* (hereinafter, "Lee"). In an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, claims 1-5, 12, and 16-24, which include the rejected claims, have been cancelled by amendment without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action states on page 3 that claims 4-5, 18-19, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,303,957

B1 to Ohwa (hereinafter, "Ohwa"). As stated above, these claims have been cancelled by amendment. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is now moot.

The Office Action states on page 4 that claims 6-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of "Applicant admitted prior art" and U.S. Pat. No. 4,335,359 to Kriedt *et al.* (hereinafter, "Kriedt"). Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of these claims.

The cited art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest a phase locked loop (PLL) circuit with dual gate dielectric thicknesses in which the PLL components including "*said oscillator, said reference frequency divider, said comparison frequency divider, said phase comparator, said charge pump, and said voltage controlled oscillator comprise devices having thin gate oxide layers,*" while the low-pass filter of the PLL comprises a capacitor which includes a *thick gate oxide layer*, as claimed in amended independent claim 1, for example. (Support for this is found in paragraphs 27 and 29 of the specification, for example.) Independent claim 11 and new independent claim 25 are similarly directed toward a phase locked loop circuit with dual gate dielectric thicknesses. The technical significance of this is that having a thick oxide layer in the capacitor of the low pass filter reduces leakage current that can be severe in the otherwise thin oxide phase locked loop circuit. The reduction in leakage current allows a stable control voltage to be maintained for the phase locked loop circuit. (See paragraph 9 of the specification for a discussion of the problem being solved.) For at least this reason, independent claims 6 and 11 and the claims depending therefrom, as well as new independent claim 25, are believed to

be allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of these claims and that they be withdrawn.

On page 5, the Office Action states that claims 9-10 and 14-15 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of "Applicant admitted prior art" and Kriedt, and further in view of Ohwa. These claims depend directly from either independent claim 6 or 11. Thus, dependent claims 9-10 and 14-15 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reason as discussed above for independent claims 6 and 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of these claims and that they be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Tam *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/026,470

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Donald J. Featherstone
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,876

Date: 6/30/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

280356_1.DOC